REMARKS

Claims 1, 5-7, 15, 19-21, and 43-46 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 15, and 43 are hereby amended. Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the claims and consideration of the following remarks.

Request to Show Support

On page 2, paragraph 2 of the recent Office Action, the Examiner requests that the Applicant provide a specific reference in the Specification to support the claims. In particular, the Examiner has requested the Applicant to show support for the limitation of the action for the second user being the same as the action for the first user, and the first alias selection not being the same as the second alias selection.

The applicant maintains that that these limitations are inherently supported by the Specification in that pages 20-23 describe a user-customized process whereby user-defined aliases are stored in user profiles accessed by an access server to perform alias translations. On page 22, paragraph 2 of the Specification, database system 522 updates user access profiles with the user's alias selections and associated actions (i.e. programs, macros, and functions). Every user therefore has a customized user access profile that holds the user's alias selections and associated actions. Thus, one user's chosen alias for an action can be different and distinct from another user's chosen alias for the same action.

Claim Rejections Based Upon 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1, 5-7, 19-21, and 43-46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,205,476 (hereinafter "Hayes"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Amended independent claim 1 now requires the step of translating the first alias selection into a first command string for the action for the first user. Importantly, claim 1 has been amended to clearly distinguish between an alias selection and a command string. As noted in the recent Office Action, Hayes discloses a user on a client points his browser at the URL of the desktop applet on a server and sends a message, such as http://server/Desktop.html (See Hayes, col. 13, lines 8-50). Such a URL would be

7

considered a command string. Thus, the client device in Hayes transmits a command string to the server for execution. In contrast, claim 1 requires transmitting an alias to the access server, and having the access server translate the alias into a command string. After performing the translation step, the command string can be executed. The command string in Hayes (http://server/Desktop.html) would be immediately executed upon reception into the server without requiring a translation step.

Independent claims 15 and 43 contain limitations similar to claim 1 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons. The dependent claims, while separately allowable over the art of record, depend from otherwise allowable independent claims. Applicant therefore refrains from a discussion of the dependent claims for the sake of brevity.

8

CONCLUSION

The claims in their present form are allowable over the art of record. Applicant therefore solicits their allowance. Any fees in addition to those submitted may be charged to deposit account 21-0765.

Respectfully submitted,

SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER
Stephen S. Roche, Reg. No. 52,176
Setter Ollila LLC
Telephone: (303) 938-9999 ext. 15
Facsimile: (303) 938-9995

Correspondence address:

CUSTOMER NO. 28004
Attn: Harley R. Ball

6391 Sprint Parkway
Mailstop: KSOPHT0101-Z2100
Overland Park, KS 66251-2100

9